

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 18-19 stand rejected as allegedly obvious over Kimball in view of Storn.

5 As applicants understand the disclosed Kimball device and supporting communication system, a user wishes to establish voice communication and designates either a conventional telephone number or an IP address for an Internet telephone device. Designation of a conventional telephone number routes the voice communication by way of conventional PSTN telephone networks. Designation of an IP address for an Internet telephone device routes the
10 voice communication by way of the Internet.

 Thus, the user places a “conventional telephone call” by designation of a telephone number and an “Internet telephone call” by designation of an IP address for an Internet telephone device. In each case the goal is to route a voice communication, in one case by way of
15 conventional telephone channels and in the other by way of Internet channels. In each case the object of communication is voice communication and any “content” accessed is a voice heard on the other end of the connection.

 Important to note, the designated telephone number and designated IP address are not the same number. Under Kimball, distinct numeric sequences activate voice and network
20 communications.

 Kimball is alleged to have shown all the elements of claim 15 except “memory speed dialing” as taught by Storn.

25 Claim 15 calls for user designation of “a numeric sequence” and user selected activation of a “network communication” and a “voice communication” using in each case the same designated numeric sequence.

Kimball does not teach or suggest that the same numeric sequence be used in user selected activation of both “voice communication” and “network communication.”

Accordingly, Kimball does not show all limitations of claim 15 except for memory speed dialing as alleged by the Examiner. In particular, the cited combination lacks a common numeric sequence for activating both voice and network communications. Adding the teachings of Storn to that of Kimball might make for more convenient dialing, but does not complete all the limitations of claim 15.

To support a 35 SC Section 103 rejection, all limitations of the subject claim must be found in the cited combination. Because Kimball uses a first numeric sequence for activating a “network communication” (as that term is applied to claim 15 by the Examiner) and a second distinct numeric sequence for activating “voice communication” and because Stron fails to incorporate this missing claimed feature of a common numeric sequence for activating both voice and network communications, the cited combination of Kimball and Stron cannot support a 35 USC Section 103 rejection of claim 15 and its dependent claims 18-19.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 15 and 18-19 as allegedly obvious in view of Kimball and Stron must be withdrawn.

Claims 16-17 and 20 stand rejected in view of Kimball and Stron as applied above, and further in view of Urs allegedly showing transition between voice and network communications.

Even if the combination of Kimball, Stron, and Urs were capable of transition between voice and network communications, such voice and network communications are activated by distinct numeric sequences.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 16-17 and 20 as allegedly obvious in view of Kimball, Stron, and Urs must be withdrawn.

The Examiner also alleges that Applicants' admitted prior art discloses the limitations of claim 20.

5 Claim 20 includes the limitations of claim 15 and, therefore, includes the above-noted claimed feature of a common numeric sequence for both voice and network communication.

Applicants respectfully traverse this characterization of applicants' discussion of prior art. In particular, applicants' discussed prior art does not teach or suggest use of a common
10 numeric sequence for voice and network communications.

Accordingly, applicants' discussion of prior art does not teach or suggest the combination of limitations represented by claim 20.

15 In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

20
Keith A. Cushing
503-220-8575
Reg. No. 32,407

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the US Postal Service as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: MAILSTOP FEE Commissioner for Patents PO BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

Date

7/6/04

Keith A. Cushing
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 32,407